

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 30, 2002, claims 1-37 are rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In this response, no claim has been cancelled or amended. Thus, claims 1-37 remain pending. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,262,886 (DiFonzo et al.) in view of U.S Patent No. 4,550,058 (Collins et al.) and admitted prior art (Admission).

Claims 8, 9, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,262,886 (DiFonzo et al.) in view of U.S Patent No. 4,550,058 (Collins et al.) and admitted prior art (Admission) as applied to claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 11, and 14 above, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,258,443-B1 (Nilsen et al.), U.S Patent No. 4,543,291 (Giles, Jr. et al.), U.S Patent No. 5,334,450 (Zabrocki et al.), U.S Patent No. 3,496,000 (Hull et al.), and U.S Patent No. 6,007,902 (Adur et al.).

Claims 3, 4, and 15-37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,262,886 (DiFonzo et al.) in view of U.S Patent No. 4,550,058 (Collins et al.) and admitted prior art (Admission) as applied to claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 11, and 14 above, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,258,443-B1 (Nilsen et al.), U.S Patent No. 4,543,291 (Giles, Jr. et al.), U.S Patent No. 5,334,450 (Zabrocki et al.), U.S Patent No. 3,496,000 (Hull et al.), and U.S Patent No. 6,007,902 (Adur et al.) as applied to claims 8, 9, 12, and 13 above,

and further in view of U.S Patent No. 5,856,371 (Grimm et al.) and U.S Patent No. 6,221,436-B1 (Perry et al.).

Applicant submits that DiFonzo is not a prior art to the present application. DiFonzo was filed September 30, 1999 (before November 29, 1999) and issued July 17, 2001 (after the filing date of the present application). In addition, DiFonzo has been assigned to a common assignee of the present application. Applicant submits that the present application and DiFonzo were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same assignee of the present application. Therefore, DiFonzo is not a prior art to the present application, see, MPEP 706.02(I)(3). As a result, claims 1-37 are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 12/17, 2002



James C. Scheller

Reg. No. 31,195

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300